

# **INDOT 2030 Plan Update Early Coordination Meeting Notes**

## **MACOG Meeting at South Bend, June 22, 2004 2:30 PM - 4:15 PM**

**In Attendance:** *Sandi Seanor, MACOG Executive Director*

*John- Paul Hopman, MACOG, GIS Network Modeling Technician Coordinator*

*Corey Hull, MACOG, Regional Planner Planning Section*

*Lihe Wang, MACOG, GIS Network Modeling Technician*

*Ruslan Ragmibekov, MACOG, GIS Network Modeling Technician*

*Steve Smith, INDOT Central Office, Transportation Planning Manager*

*Roy Nunnally, INDOT Central Office, Transportation Planner*

Steve Smith kicked the meeting off discussing the meeting's purpose and expected outcome and also provided some feedback to MACOG as to why INDOT is performing the plan update at this time prior to the MPO's upcoming plan update. Sandi notes, without the MPO 2030 models being developed, input to the 2030 planning horizon will be limited. Steve explained a 2030 plan update is needed as well as requested from INDOT executives. Also, INDOT has updated the statewide model which now extends to the 2030 planning horizon. Steve note that changes in existing and new identified projects from the MPO's plan update can be amended into the plan next year if warranted.

Relative to project evaluations of the existing INDOT 25-year plan and discussion of the INDOT statewide model input, Sandi requested that more time is provided for the MACOG staff to properly evaluate and review the statewide model inputs. Sandi requested an extract of the statewide model build and no-build networks; and 2030 HERS\_IN output for a four county area: Elkhart, Kosciusko, Marshall, and St. Joseph Counties. Sandi notes that her staff will evaluate these outputs relative to outputs from their 2025 models and will provide their inputs in the last week of July. In the meantime, the MACOG received hardcopies of the 2030 Build and No-Build Networks (052504 Network) and HERS\_IN Output. Sandi will provide additional information once her staff completes evaluation of the INDOT 25-Year plan, the 2030 Build/No-Build network, and the HERS\_IN output.

### **PROJECT EVALUATION DISCUSSIONS**

- Project Discrepancies - Corey Hull went through a list of projects from INDOT's 25-year plan with minor discrepancies such as: incorrect county codes, projects listed as not being in the MPO plan, and projects that now have Des #'s not listed in the plan.

**Comment:** *It was noted that an outdated project listing for the MACOG area was posted on INDOT's webpage. Most of the discrepancies listed above were corrected in last years plan update with exception of the issue with projects listed in the INDOT plan as not being in the MPO plan. The INDOT planning section will post the correct project layer to the INDOT webpage, correct identified discrepancies in our Access database, and check for changes in RFC Dates for short range projects (Funding Period 1) in SPMS.*

## **PLANNING ISSUES**

- Mobility Corridor, CR 17 Kosciusko County – Discussed the north-south corridor, Sandi recommends INDOT consider this proposed alternative and supports this project as a viable concept for the long range.
- Mobility Corridor, SR 17 from Culvar to US 30 – Sandi notes that this proposed mobility corridor concept was submitted to the LaPorte District. Sandi also notes that Marshall County is interested in this project and recommends that INDOT incorporate this proposed project in the 2030 plan as a “Placeholder” type project.

## **OTHER ISSUES**

- Discussions relative to the RFC Date used in the current INDOT plan. MACOG notes that RFC Dates are useless for MPO’s with air quality attainment years. MACOG suggested that the 2030 plan include “Open to Traffic” dates. Using open to traffic dates would allow MPO plans to match INDOT’s transportation plan project listing. The planning section responded that open to traffic dates would be a best guess date which would not be accurate for MPO attainment years. The planning section notes all projects are different and actual completion times could vary significantly especially if ROW or environmental issues come into play. MACOG suggests that an INDOT group be formed including Janice Osadczuk, Brad Steckler, and others to evaluate and comment on short range projects to nail down open to traffic dates. MACOG also suggest that the INDOT planning section consult with all MPOs relative to conformity attainment years to develop funding periods that closely matches all MPOs.
- MACOG notes that median construction projects listed in the INDOT 25-year plan with lengths greater than 1-mile should be reclassified as added travel lanes projects to be consistent with air quality policies used by MPOs as well as the MPO’s project listing. MACOG reiterates this is a big issue as the INDOT and MPO plan needs to be consistent for conformity purpose.
- Traffic Counts –MACOG conducts traffic counts for the four county areas on state facilities. MACOG extends this count data to INDOT for future model developments or as needed.